

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 320

CS 001 616

AUTHOR Martin, Maxie; Chambers, Letitia
TITLE Evaluation of the Elementary Reading Survey K-5, 1973-1974.
INSTITUTION Oklahoma City Public School System, Okla.
PUB DATE Aug 74
NOTE 49p.
JOURNAL CIT Journal of Research and Evaluation of the Oklahoma City Public Schools; v4 n8 Entire Issue Aug 1974

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Effective Teaching; Elementary Education; Reading; Reading Achievement; *Reading Improvement; *Reading Instruction; Reading Programs; *Reading Research
IDENTIFIERS *Oklahoma City Public Schools

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this study were to make comparisons between reading at all grades on the basis of instruction and materials and the Oklahoma City public schools' reading philosophy, and to provide insight as to why the reading grade scores were low, particularly at the fourth grade level. The evaluation process was concerned with surveying the reading methods, materials, and types of reading skills being used and/or developed in first through fifth grade. The instrument used was a questionnaire which was administered to teachers in 70 elementary schools and 14 fifth-year centers. The criteria for the instrument to evaluate the elementary reading program were based on the Oklahoma City School District's philosophy for the teaching of reading. Some of the results were: there may be a strong relationship between the drop in achievement scores at the fourth-grade level and the fact that only half of the fourth-grade teachers felt it their responsibility to provide formal reading instruction; teachers voiced a desire for further inservice training; first- and fourth-year teachers were attempting to cover all the basal reading materials for their grade level each year; and teachers spent almost as much time planning for each day as they did on actual reading instruction. (WR)


ED101320

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JOURNAL OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
OF THE **OKLAHOMA CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS**



**1973-74 ELEMENTARY READING
SURVEY K-5**

**OKLAHOMA CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
BILL LILLARD, SUPERINTENDENT
OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA**

**VOLUME 4 . . . NUMBER 8
AUGUST 1974**

05 001 616

ED101320

EVALUATION OF THE ELEMENTARY
READING SURVEY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Maxie Martin
Research Associate

and

Dr. Letitia Chambers
Director of Federal Projects

Department of Research and Statistics
William L. Shell, Director
Oklahoma City Public Schools
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

EVALUATION OF THE ELEMENTARY
READING SURVEY

ABSTRACT
1973-1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Evaluator: Maxie Martin
Consultant: Dr. Letitia Chambers

Schools 84
Teachers 830

Description: Improvement in reading was designated as a priority objective for the 1973-1974 school year by the Oklahoma City Board of Education. Dr. Mervel Lunn, Assistant Superintendent for Instructional Services, directed that an elementary reading study be conducted. In addition, the need for this study was based in part on the results of the Spring, 1973, standardized test results. The purpose of this study was twofold: one, to make comparisons between reading at all grades on the basis of instruction and materials and the Oklahoma City School's reading philosophy; and two, to give insight as to why the reading grade scores were low, particularly at the fourth grade level, thus providing knowledge leading to improved reading instruction.

Objectives:

- To describe likenesses and differences in the teaching of reading at all grade levels on the basis of instruction and materials.
- To discover causes of variation within District grade level reading achievement scores.
- To determine areas of need for further in-service training to improve reading instruction.

Evaluation Strategy: The evaluation process was concerned with surveying the reading methods, materials, and types of reading skills being used and/or developed in first through fifth grade. The instrument used was a questionnaire which was administered to teachers in seventy elementary schools and fourteen fifth year centers. The criteria for the instrument to evaluate the elementary reading program was based on the Oklahoma City School District's philosophy for the teaching of reading.

Results:

1. There may be a strong relationship between the drop in achievement scores at the fourth year grade level and the fact that only half of the fourth grade teachers feel it is their responsibility to provide formal reading instruction.

2. The sharp rise in the amount of team teaching at the fifth year level may in part account for the yearly gain in reading scores between fourth and fifth year students.
3. Teachers have voiced a desire for further in-service training.
4. Teachers at every level are not completely aware of the ranges in reading achievement levels of students in their classrooms.
5. While the basal reading program employed in the District is effective with most children, test scores reveal other children are seemingly not responsive to this method.
6. First and fourth year teachers are attempting to cover all the basal reading materials for their grade level each year.
7. Teachers spend almost as much time planning for each day as they do on actual reading instruction.
8. Teachers at all levels prefer to group for reading in the following order: (1) achievement groups; (2) skill study groups; (3) discussion groups; and (4) special interest groups.
9. Teachers reported that they are frequently grouping in their classrooms, yet at the same time they reported that most students in their classes are usually working at the same assignment. There is a definite contradiction between these two statements. Ideal grouping does not occur when all children in a classroom are divided into small groups to work on the same assignment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Curriculum and Research Departments would like to express their appreciation to the following individuals who participated in the design, implementation, and evaluation of this survey:

Dr. Melvin Todd	- Director of Curriculum
Nelda Tebow	- Coordinator Curriculum Implementation
Frances Jackson	- Psychometrist--Group Testing
Lorena Hollingsworth	- Curriculum Consultant
Margaret Gregory	- Curriculum Consultant
Martha Hayes	- Learning Center Consultant
Gene Steiger	- Coordinator Special Projects
Principals and Teachers	- Elementary Schools
Principals and Teachers	- Fifth Year Centers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chapter	Page
I INTRODUCTION	1
History and Need for the Study	1
Evaluation	3
II RESULTS	4
Oklahoma City Reading Philosophy	4
Present Teaching Situations	4
Average Amount of Time Spent Daily on Reading Instruction	4
Teaching Techniques	5
Methods of Grouping for Reading	6
Grouping Activities	6
Reading Approaches	7
Range in Reading Achievement Levels	10
Range in Reading Materials	10
Evaluation of Student Performance	14
Equipment Utilized in Teaching Reading	14
In-Service Training	18
Areas of Need for Further In-Service Training	18
Interactive Involvement Utilized in Teaching Reading	18
Supportive Materials Utilized in the Teaching of Reading	21
Skills Utilized with Each Story in the Basal Reader	21
Planning	21
Planning Activities	21
Diagnostic Procedures	24
Instructional Materials	27
III CONCLUSIONS	29
APPENDIX A	33
APPENDIX B	40

LIST OF TABLES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table		Page
I	Perceived District Reading Philosophy	5
II	Independent Reading Philosophy	6
III	Present Teaching Situations	7
IV	Teaching Techniques: Mean Scores and Ranks	8
V	Methods for Grouping for Reading: Mean Scores and Rankings	10
VI	Grouping Activities: Mean Scores	11
VII	Reading Approaches: Mean Scores and Ranks	12
VIII	Range in Reading Materials and Reading Achievement Levels	13
IX	Evaluation of Student Performance: Mean Scores	15
X	Equipment Utilized in Teaching Reading: Mean Scores	17
XI	Areas of Need for Further In-Service Training	19
XII	Interactive Involvement Utilized in Teaching Reading: Mean Scores and Rankings	20
XIII	Supportive Materials Utilized in the Teaching of Reading: Mean Scores and Rankings	22
XIV	Skills Utilized with Each Story in the Basal Reader: Mean Scores and Rankings	23
XV	Planning Activities	25
XVI	Diagnostic Procedures: Mean Scores	26
XVII	Instructional Materials: Mean Scores	28
XVIII	Comparison of Perceived Range with Actual Range of Reading Achievement Levels	30
XIX	Elementary Reading Survey District Means, Ranks, and Percentages	41

CHAPTER I

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

History and Need for the Study

Society's needs and demands are the primary sources of educational goals. Final selection of objectives ultimately depends upon a specific group's convictions and its philosophy of education. Improvement in reading was designated as a priority objective for the 1973-1974 school year by the Oklahoma City Board of Education. Dr. Mervel Lunn, Assistant Superintendent for Instructional Services, directed that a study be conducted to survey the reading methods, materials, and types of reading skills being used and/or developed in first through fifth grade.

In addition, the need for this study was based in part on the results of the Spring, 1973, standardized test results. These results for each grade level are as follows:

<u>Grade</u>	<u>District Mean</u>	<u>National Mean</u>	<u>Deviation from the National Mean</u>
1	2.0	1.8	+ .2
2	2.8	2.6	+ .2
3	3.4	3.5	- .1
4	3.7	4.6	- .9
5	4.5	5.6	- 1.1

These scores show that at the end of first and second grade, the reading score means of the Oklahoma City pupils were above the national mean. The

third grade score shows a slight deviation below the national mean. The fourth and fifth grade scores show a greater deviation below the national mean.

Also, from these standardized test scores the reading gains from end of year to end of year testing were determined. The reading scores used to determine yearly gains were cross-sectional, not longitudinal in nature.

These reading gains for each grade level were as follows:

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Grade Equivalent Score Mean</u>	<u>Yearly Gain</u>
1	2.0	
2	2.8	.8
3	3.4	.6
4	3.7	.3
5	4.5	.8

These figures indicate that at the end of the first grade, the reading score mean is above grade level. The second and third grade score mean shows a gradually increasing decline in reading gains, while the fourth grade score mean shows a sharp drop in reading gains. The higher fifth grade gain indicates that fifth graders were reading on a higher level as compared to the national norm than the fourth, but this difference does not make up for the extreme drop at fourth grade.

As a result of Dr. Lunn's request and the 1973 standardized test results, the Research Department proceeded to undertake a descriptive study of the teaching of reading at the elementary level. The purpose of this study was twofold: one, to make comparisons between reading at all grades on the basis of instruction and materials and the Oklahoma City School's reading philosophy; and two, to give insight as to why the reading grade scores were low, particularly at the fourth grade level, thus providing knowledge leading to improved reading instruction.

Evaluation

Objectives

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- To describe likenesses and differences in the teaching of reading at all grade levels on the basis of instruction and materials.
- To discover causes of variation within District grade level reading achievement scores.
- To determine areas of need for further in-service training to improve reading instruction.

Instrumentation

The instrument used was a questionnaire which can be found in Appendix A. This questionnaire was administered to teachers in seventy elementary schools and fourteen fifth year centers. The criteria for the instrument to evaluate the elementary reading program was based on the Oklahoma City School District's philosophy for the teaching of reading.

RESULTS

Oklahoma City Reading Philosophy

Sixty-two percent of the teachers surveyed on this questionnaire felt that the following statement reflected the reading philosophy of the majority of teachers in the Oklahoma City Public Schools:

"In grades 1-3, children learn to read; in grades 4 and up, children read to learn."

Table I shows percentages for each grade level. The majority of teachers (53%) responded that this statement did not reflect their own personal reading philosophy. However, this statement does reflect the philosophy of 47% of the teachers in grades kindergarten through fifth. (See Table II)

Present Teaching Situations

In grades kindergarten through fifth, 58.1% of the teachers are teaching in self-contained classrooms. Eighty percent of the teachers at the fifth year level are teaching in team teaching situations. In the EMH and L.D. classes, 88.1% of the teachers classified their teaching situations as other than either self-contained or team teaching. These "other" situations may be considered as laboratory situations. (See Table III)

Average Amount of Time Spent Daily
on Reading Instruction

Elementary teachers are spending on the average one hour and thirty minutes daily on reading instruction. In kindergarten, EMH, and L.D. classes, only one hour per day on the average is devoted to reading instruction.

TABLE I
PERCEIVED DISTRICT READING PHILOSOPHY
Elementary
1973-1974
Percentages of Total Response

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Does the following statement reflect the reading philosophy of the majority of teachers in the Oklahoma City Public Schools:

"In grades 1-3, children learn to read; in grades 4 and up
children read to learn."

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Kindergarten	65.5%	34.5%
1	63.6	36.4
2	68.1	34.9
3	66.4	33.6
4	58.8	41.2
5	56.9	43.1
1 and 2 combined	71.9	28.1
2 and 3 combined	65.4	34.6
3-5	54.7	45.3
EMH, L.D.	60.5	39.5
DISTRICT	62.4	37.6

Teaching Techniques

At the kindergarten level, reading to children was the most often used technique to teach reading. Oral reading by children ranked first as the technique used most frequently in first grade. Discussion was the teaching technique used most in second, third, fourth, and fifth grades. District-wide, the three techniques used most often were discussion, oral reading by children, and group question and answer sessions. Lecture and contracts were the two teaching techniques least frequently used. Table IV shows rankings and mean scores (averages) for each grade level.

TABLE II
INDEPENDENT READING PHILOSOPHY
Elementary
1973-1974
Percentages of Total Response

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Does the preceeding statement reflect your reading philosophy?

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Kindergarten	48.3%	51.7%
1	39.4	60.6
2	53.1	46.9
3	52.2	47.8
4	49.6	50.4
5	42.3	57.7
1 and 2 combined	50.0	50.0
2 and 3 combined	50.0	50.0
3-5	45.2	54.8
EMH, L.D.	44.7	55.3
DISTRICT	46.8	53.2

Methods of Grouping for Reading

Elementary teachers at all levels (except in EMH and L.D. classes) ranked methods of grouping in the following order as to frequency of usage: achievement groups, skill study groups, discussion groups, and special interest groups. Achievement groups and skill study groups shared the top ranking in the EMH and L.D. classes followed by special interest groups and then discussion groups. (See Table V)

Grouping Activities

At all levels, students usually are involved in small group activities. Goals are always set in the EMH and L.D. classes before instruction in small group activities and usually at all other levels. Teachers in all grades (except kindergarten) reported that all students in the class usually are

TABLE III
PRESENT TEACHING SITUATIONS
Elementary
1973-1974
Percentages of Total Responses

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	Self-Contained	Team Teaching	Other
Kindergarten	72.4%	27.6%	0.0%
1	81.8	21.2	.1
2	68.1	29.2	.5
3	81.4	21.2	0.0
4	76.5	18.5	.9
5	13.1	80.0	.8
1 and 2 combined	68.8	28.1	.3
2 and 3 combined	69.2	27.0	.4
3-5	52.8	45.3	.4
EMH, L.D.	.9	.1	88.1
DISTRICT	58.1	31.9	12.0

working at the same assignment. This occurs only frequently at the kindergarten level. Students in the first, second, and third year levels always meet every day for instructions from the teacher when involved in group activities. Kindergarten, fourth, fifth, EMH, and L.D. students usually meet with the teacher for instructions every day when grouping. (See Table VI)

Reading Approaches

The basal reader was ranked as the reading approach most preferred by first, second, third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers. Kindergarten teachers selected the phonics approach while EMH and L.D. teachers ranked the multimedia nongraded approach as their preference in reading approaches. Table VII shows rankings and mean scores for each grade level.

TABLE IV

TEACHING TECHNIQUES: MEAN SCORES AND RANKS
Elementary
1973-1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	Lecture	Question and Answer (Class)	Question and Answer (Group)	Question and Answer (Individually)	Contracts	Discussion	Reading to Children	Oral Reading By Children
Kindergarten								
Mean Rank	2.2 7	3.2 4	3.4 5.5	3.6 2.5	1.2 8	3.6 2.5	4.2 1	3.4 5.5
1								
Mean Rank	2.0 7	3.4 6	4.0 2.5	3.7 5	1.4 8	4.0 2.5	3.8 4	4.3 1
2								
Mean Rank	2.0 7	3.1 6	3.9 3	3.6 4.5	1.6 8	4.2 1	3.6 4.5	4.0 2
3								
Mean Rank	2.0 7	3.0 6	3.9 2	3.6 3.5	1.8 8	4.2 1	3.4 5	3.6 3.5
4								
Mean Rank	2.0 7	3.0 6	3.7 2	3.3 3.5	1.8 8	4.0 1	3.3 3.5	3.2 5
5								
Mean Rank	2.2 7	3.1 5	3.7 2	3.4 3	2.4 6	4.1 1	2.9 8	3.2 4

TABLE IV (con't)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	Lecture	Question and Answer (Class)	Question and Answer (Group)	Question and Answer (Individually)	Contracts	Discussion	Reading by Children	Oral Reading By Children
1 and 2 combined Mean Rank	1.7 7.5	3.0 6	4.0 2	3.7 5	1.7 7.5	4.0 2	3.6 4	4.0 2
2 and 3 combined Mean Rank	1.8 7	2.9 6	4.0 1.5	3.9 3	1.7 8	4.0 1.5	3.6 5	3.7 4
3-5 Mean Rank	1.9 8	2.8 6	3.5 2.5	3.1 5	1.8 7	3.8 1	3.3 4	3.5 2.5
EMI, L.D. Mean Rank	1.6 8	2.2 7	2.9 4	3.8 1	2.8 5	3.4 3	2.7 6	3.6 2
DISTRICT MEAN DISTRICT RANK	1.9 7.5	3.0 6	3.7 2.5	3.5 4	1.9 7.5	4.0 1	3.4 5	3.7 2.5

1--Highest rank
8--Lowest rank

TABLE V
METHODS FOR GROUPING FOR READING:
MEAN SCORES AND RANKINGS
Elementary
1973-1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	Achievement Groups		Discussion Groups		Special Interest Groups		Skill Study Groups	
	<u>X</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>Rank</u>
Kindergarten	3.3	1	2.7	3	2.5	4	3.2	2
1	4.5	1	2.6	3	2.3	4	3.4	2
2	4.5	1	3.0	3	2.5	4	3.6	2
3	4.4	1	3.0	3	2.8	4	3.5	2
4	4.2	1	3.3	3	2.9	4	3.6	2
5	4.0	1	3.2	3	2.7	4	3.6	2
1 and 2 combined	4.3	1	2.5	3	2.2	4	3.3	2
2 and 3 combined	4.1	1	2.6	3.5	2.6	3.5	3.6	2
3-5	4.1	1	3.0	3	2.8	4	3.3	2
EMH, L.D.	3.2	1.5	2.1	4	2.2	3	3.2	1.5
DISTRICT	4.14	1	2.89	3	2.59	4	3.48	2

Range In Reading Achievement Levels

Kindergarten teachers reported they have only two reading achievement levels while first year teachers reported three levels of student reading achievement levels. All other grades reported approximately four levels of student reading achievement levels in their classrooms. (See Table VIII)

Range in Reading Materials

Kindergarten teachers reported they have two levels, first year teachers three levels, EMH and L.D. teachers five levels of reading materials in their classrooms. Second, third, fourth, and fifth year teachers reported that they have four levels of reading materials in their classroom. (See Table VIII)

TABLE VI
GROUPING ACTIVITIES: MEAN SCORES
Elementary
1973-1974
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	How often are students involved in small group activities?	Are goals set before instruction in small group activities?	How often are all students in the class working at the same assignment?	When grouping, does every group meet with the teacher every day for instruction?
Kindergarten	4.2	3.8	3.4	3.9
1	3.8	4.1	3.6	4.7
2	3.6	4.0	3.8	4.7
3	3.7	4.1	4.0	4.5
4	3.7	4.2	4.0	4.2
5	3.6	4.2	3.6	3.7
1 and 2 combined	3.6	4.2	4.1	4.6
2 and 3 combined	3.6	4.1	4.2	4.5
3-5	3.7	4.0	4.2	4.0
EM, L.D.	4.0	4.5	4.1	3.9
DISTRICT	3.72	4.13	3.85	4.27

Key: 5 = always
4 = usually
3 = frequently
2 = occasionally
1 = never or does not apply

TABLE VII

READING APPROACHES: MEAN SCORES AND RANKS
Elementary
1973-1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	Basal Reader		Language Experience Approach		Library Centered Approach		Programmed Materials		Phonics Approach		Sight Approach		Multi-Media Nongraded Approach	
	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank
Kindergarten	4.8	6	3.2	3	5.9	7	4.1	4	2.2	1	4.6	5	3.1	2
1	1.9	1	3.7	3	6.2	7	4.1	4.5	2.8	2	5.3	6	4.1	4.5
2	2.1	1	3.6	3	5.3	6	4.2	5	3.2	2	5.8	7	3.7	4
3	1.9	1	3.8	3.5	5.1	6	4.1	5	3.2	2	5.7	7	3.8	3.5
4	1.9	1	4.0	5	4.7	6	3.9	3.5	3.7	2	5.9	7	3.9	3.5
5	2.3	1	4.0	4	4.7	6	4.1	5	3.9	3	5.9	7	3.0	2
1 and 2 combined	2.3	1	4.1	5	5.8	7	3.9	4	3.1	3	5.7	7	3.0	2
2 and 3 combined	2.2	1	3.7	4	5.3	6	4.2	5	3.3	2	6.0	7	3.4	3
3-5	2.0	1	3.8	3	5.3	6	3.9	4	4.0	5	5.8	7	3.3	2
EM, L.D.	4.6	5	3.4	3	6.0	7	3.8	4	3.0	2	4.9	6	2.4	1
DISTRICT	2.4	1	3.8	4	5.3	6	4.1	5	3.4	2	5.6	7	3.5	3
1--Highest rank														
7--Lowest rank														

TABLE VIII
RANGE IN READING MATERIALS AND READING ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS
Elementary
1973-1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	5 Grade Levels or More		4 Grade Levels		3 Grade Levels		2 Grade Levels	
	Reading Materials	Reading Achievement Levels	Reading Materials	Reading Achievement Levels	Reading Materials	Reading Achievement Levels	Reading Materials	Reading Achievement Levels
Kindergarten								
1					2.98		2.17	2.45
2			3.50			3.06		
3			3.82	3.82		3.39		
4			3.72	3.83				
5			3.63	3.67				
1 and 2 combined			3.59			3.43		
2 and 3 combined			3.88	3.80				
3-5			3.96	3.86				
EMH, L.D.	4.56			4.32				
DISTRICT			3.52	3.53				

Evaluation of Student Performance

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Student performance is measured in terms of his own progress always in the EMH and L.D. classes, usually in the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth grades, and frequently in kindergarten. Individual student records are entered in a grade book usually at the fifth year level, frequently in kindergarten, third, and fourth grade, and only occasionally in first, EMH, and L.D. classes.

Usage of individual language progress folders for keeping individual student records was reported usually at all levels from kindergarten through fifth and frequently in EMH and L.D. classes. Fifth year, EMH, and L.D. students are frequently allowed access to their records. Third and fourth grade students are allowed occasional access to their records while kindergarten, first, and second year students are generally never allowed access to their records.

Students in fourth, fifth, EMH, and L.D. classes are usually kept informed of their progress at least weekly. While kindergarten, first, second, and third year students are only frequently informed weekly of their progress. Skill mastery is always evaluated periodically in the EMH and L.D. classes and usually at all other grade levels. (See Table IX)

Equipment Utilized in Teaching Reading

The record player was the most frequently used piece of equipment in kindergarten, first, second, and fourth year classes to teach reading. Earphones were utilized most by the third year teachers and the cassette by EMH and L.D. teachers. Fifth year teachers reported using the record player, filmstrip projector, and overhead projector the same amount in teaching reading. The tachistoscope was the least frequently used piece of equipment at all grade levels. (See Table X)

TABLE IX

EVALUATION OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE: MEAN SCORES
Elementary
1973-1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	Is student performance measured in terms of his own progress?	Do you enter individual student records in a grade book?	Do you use individual language progress folders for keeping individual student records?
Kindergarten	3.3	2.7	3.9
1	3.8	2.0	4.3
2	4.0	2.3	4.2
3	4.1	3.1	4.3
4	4.1	3.4	4.2
5	4.3	3.9	4.3
1 and 2 combined	4.3	2.3	4.5
2 and 3 combined	4.2	2.6	4.0
3-5	4.0	2.8	4.1
EM, L.D.	4.8	1.9	3.3
DISTRICT	4.13	2.79	4.15

Key: 5 = always

4 = usually

3 = frequently

2 = occasionally

1 = never or does not apply

TABLE IX (con't) BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	Do you allow students access to these records?	Are students kept informed of their progress at least weekly?	Do you evaluate skill mastery periodically?
Kindergarten	1.4	2.8	3.8
1	1.3	3.0	4.0
2	1.4	3.3	4.0
3	1.7	3.4	3.9
4	2.0	3.6	3.9
5	2.7	4.0	4.1
1 and 2 combined	1.3	2.8	4.1
2 and 3 combined	1.7	3.2	4.0
3-5	1.6	3.2	3.7
EMH, L.D.	2.6	4.1	4.5
DISTRICT	1.84	2.82	4.01

Key: 5 = always
 4 = usually
 3 = frequently
 2 = occasionally
 1 = never or does not apply

TABLE X

EQUIPMENT UTILIZED IN TEACHING READING: MEAN SCORES
Elementary
1973-1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	Cassette	Tape Recorder	Earphones	Filmstrip Projector	Overhead Projector	Film Projector	Record Player	Tachistoscope
Kindergarten	2.0	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.3	2.4	3.0	1.2
1	2.0	2.6	3.1	2.6	2.5	2.3	3.3	1.1
2	2.3	2.6	3.0	2.7	2.6	2.4	3.2	1.2
3	2.1	2.7	3.0	2.7	2.9	2.3	2.9	1.1
4	2.1	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.3	2.9	1.2
5	2.1	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.5	2.7	1.2
1 and 2 combined	2.2	2.6	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.3	3.0	1.3
2 and 3 combined	2.0	2.7	2.9	2.6	2.7	2.5	3.0	1.3
3-5	2.2	2.8	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.5	2.8	1.2
EMI, L.D.	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.0	2.7	2.1	3.0	2.0
DISTRICT	2.27	2.70	2.93	2.70	2.67	2.05	2.98	1.28

In-Service Training

Eighty-nine percent of the teachers surveyed reported that they had participated in in-service training sessions in this school system. The majority of the in-service training sessions that were attended were held either at the central office or in a school building other than their own. Sixty-six percent of the respondents to this questionnaire replied that if more after school in-service training sessions were offered, they would attend.

Areas of Need for Further In-Service Training

Kindergarten teachers ranked diagnostic techniques as the area in which they felt the greatest need for further in-service training. First, second, third, EMH, and L.D. teachers selected as their top priority area for further in-service training ways in which children learn. Individualized instruction was chosen by fourth and fifth year teachers as their area of need for further in-service training. Table XI shows mean scores and rankings for each grade level.

Interactive Involvement Utilized in Teaching Reading

Teachers in grades kindergarten, first, second, fifth, EMH, and L.D. selected role playing as the type of interactive involvement they use most often in teaching reading. Class projects were ranked first by third and fourth year teachers. Field trips were the least frequently used type of interactive involvement utilized by teachers at all grade levels to teach reading. (See Table XII)

TABLE XI

AREAS OF NEED FOR FURTHER IN-SERVICE TRAINING
Elementary
1973-1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	Diagnostic Technique		Small Group Instruction		Individualized Instruction		Peer Teaching		Classroom Organization and Management		Learning Stations		Ways in Which Children Learn	
	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank
Kindergarten														
1	37.9	1	17.2	6	34.5	2.5	13.8	7	20.7	5	24.1	4	34.5	2.5
2	37.1	4	25.8	5	38.6	3	11.4	7	19.7	6	39.4	2	46.2	1
3	36.3	4	28.3	5	38.1	2.5	13.3	7	24.8	6	38.1	2.5	44.2	1
4	41.6	3	20.4	6	44.2	2	14.2	7	25.7	5	40.7	4	47.8	1
5	40.3	2	25.2	5	42.9	1	24.4	6	19.3	7	38.7	3.5	38.7	3.5
	41.6	4	24.8	7	53.3	1	27.0	6	28.5	5	48.9	2	44.5	3
1 and 2 combined	34.4	4	0.6	7	37.5	2.5	18.8	6	25.0	5	37.5	2.5	50.0	1
2 and 3 combined	42.3	2	19.2	6	38.5	3	15.4	7	23.1	5	53.8	1	34.6	4
3-5	50.9	1	18.9	6	37.7	3.5	16.9	7	28.3	5	37.7	3.5	43.4	2
EMI, L.D.	46.1	3	14.5	7	50.0	2	17.1	6	18.4	5	34.2	4	55.3	1
DISTRICT	40.6	3	22.4	6	43.1	2	17.8	7	23.4	5	40.1	4	44.8	1
1--Highest rank														
7--Lowest rank														

TABLE XII

INTERACTIVE INVOLVEMENT UTILIZED IN
TEACHING READING: MEAN SCORES AND RANKINGS
Elementary
1973-1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	Field Trips		Class Projects		Creative Dramatics		Role Playing	
	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank
Kindergarten	1.7	4	2.7	3	3.1	2	3.2	1
1	1.7	4	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.8	1
2	1.8	4	2.7	1.5	2.5	3	2.7	1.5
3	1.7	4	2.8	1	2.5	3	2.6	2
4	1.8	4	2.9	1	2.6	3	2.7	2
5	2.1	4	2.8	2.5	2.8	2.5	2.9	1
1 and 2 combined	1.6	4	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.9	1
2 and 3 combined	1.5	4	2.6	1.5	2.4	3	2.6	1.5
3-5	1.8	4	2.7	2	2.7	2	2.7	2
EMH, L.D.	1.3	4	1.7	3	2.0	2	2.3	1
DISTRICT	1.76	4	2.64	2	2.56	3	2.73	1
1--Highest rank								
4--Lowest rank								

Supportive Materials Utilized in the Teaching of Reading

Teachers at all grade levels (except kindergarten, EMH, and L.D.) reported that materials provided in the basal reader were the type of supportive materials utilized most frequently in the teaching of reading. Kindergarten teachers ranked other teacher made materials first while EMH and L.D. teachers ranked both other teacher made materials and commercial remedial or developmental programs on the same level. (See Table XIII)

Skills Utilized with Each Story in the Basal Reader

Word attack skills were ranked first as the skills most frequently utilized with each story in the basal reader by first, second, EMH, and L.D. teachers. Teachers in third, fourth, and fifth grade classes ranked comprehension skills first. Word attack skills and comprehension skills were both ranked first by kindergarten teachers. Literary skills were the least utilized skills. Table XIV provides mean scores and rankings for each grade level.

Planning

Elementary teachers in grades kindergarten through fifth spent an average of one hour planning for each school day. EMH and L.D. teachers reported they spend an average of one hour thirty minutes planning for each school day. Fifty-three percent of the teachers surveyed reported they are unable to do the majority of their planning at school.

Planning Activities

Only first year teachers reported that they occasionally felt pressure from the administration or competition with other teachers over the amount

TABLE XIII

SUPPORTIVE MATERIALS UTILIZED IN THE
TEACHING OF READING: MEAN SCORES AND RANKINGS
Elementary
1973-1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	Supportive Material from the Basal Reader		Teacher-Pupil Developed Reading Charts		Experience Charts		Other Teacher Made Materials		Commercial, Remedial, or Developmental Programs		Unipacs	
	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank
Kindergarten	2.2	2	3.2	3	2.8	4.5	3.7	1	2.8	4.5	1.3	6
1	4.0	1	3.2	3	3.0	4	3.7	2	2.6	5	1.3	6
2	4.0	1	2.9	3	2.7	4	3.6	2	2.6	5	1.3	6
3	4.1	1	2.9	3	2.6	5	3.4	2	2.8	4	1.3	6
4	4.2	1	2.6	3	2.3	5	3.0	2	2.5	4	1.3	6
5	4.0	1	2.8	3.5	2.4	5	3.6	2	2.8	3.5	1.7	6
1 and 2 combined	4.3	1	3.3	3	3.1	4	3.6	2	2.6	5	1.3	6
2 and 3 combined	4.0	1	3.0	3	2.4	4	3.6	2	2.7	5	1.3	6
3-5	4.0	1	2.6	4	2.3	5	3.3	2	2.7	3	1.6	6
EMH, L.D.	2.6	5	2.9	3	2.7	4	3.8	1.5	3.8	1.5	2.1	6
DISTRICT	3.91	1	2.89	3	2.63	5	3.52	2	2.77	4	1.48	6
1--Highest rank												
7--Lowest rank												

TABLE XIV

SKILLS UTILIZED WITH EACH STORY IN THE
BASAL READER: MEAN SCORES AND RANKINGS
Elementary
1973-1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	Word Attack Skills		Comprehension Skills		Reference and Study Skills		Literary Skills	
	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank
Kindergarten								
1	3.5	1.5	3.5	1.5	2.0	3.5	2.0	3.5
2	4.7	1	4.6	2	3.6	3	3.0	4
3	4.7	1	4.6	2	3.7	3	3.0	4
4	4.6	2	4.7	1	3.9	3	3.3	4
5	4.5	2	4.7	1	4.1	3	3.5	4
	4.2	2	4.5	1	4.0	3	3.5	4
1 and 2 combined	4.6	2	4.7	1	3.6	3	3.0	4
2 and 3 combined	4.6	2	4.8	1	3.8	3	3.0	4
3-5	4.3	2	4.5	1	3.7	3	3.0	4
EM, L.D.	3.8	1	3.6	2	2.6	3	2.1	4
DISTRICT	4.42	2	4.51	1	3.68	3	3.06	4

1--Highest rank
4--Lowest rank

of material covered. Teachers at all levels frequently plan with other teachers. The greatest amount of planning with other teachers was reported by fifth year teachers.

First and fourth year teachers usually cover all the basal reading materials for their grade level each year. Kindergarten, second, third, and fifth year teachers frequently cover all the material while EMH and L.D. only occasionally cover all the materials for their grade levels each year. Teachers at all grade levels are using the teacher's guide when using the basal reader. (See Table XV)

Diagnostic Procedures

The diagnostic material from the basal reading program is used the least in the kindergarten, EMH, and L.D. classes. This material is usually used by all other grade levels.

Frequently other tests to determine individual needs are used in kindergarten, first, second, and third year classes. They are usually utilized in fourth and fifth year classes and always used in EMH and L.D. classes.

Fifth year, EMH, and L.D. teachers reported that they usually use a scope and sequence other than the one in the basal reader. All other grade levels only occasionally use a different scope and sequence.

Teachers in the third, fourth, fifth, EMH, and L.D. classes usually involve students in planning their own programs. Kindergarten, first, and second grade teachers only occasionally involve students.

EMH and L.D. teachers always plan individual reading programs for each student. This is frequently done at all other grade levels. (See Table XVI)

TABLE XV
PLANNING ACTIVITIES
Elementary
1973-1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	Do you cover all the basal reading materials for your grade level each year?	Do you feel pressure from the administration or competition with other teachers over the amount of material covered?	How often do you plan with other teachers?	How much do you use the teacher's guide when using the basal reader?
Kindergarten	3.3	1.4	2.5	3.9
1	3.5	1.7	2.7	4.6
2	3.4	1.4	2.7	4.7
3	3.3	1.3	2.5	4.7
4	3.6	1.3	2.5	4.7
5	2.7	1.4	3.4	4.4
1 and 2 combined	3.2	1.7	2.8	4.5
2 and 3 combined	3.4	1.5	2.4	4.5
3-5	3.2	1.5	2.9	4.4
EMH, L.D.	1.6	1.1	2.9	4.0
DISTRICT	2.86	1.41	2.78	4.41

Key: 5=always
4=usually
3=frequently
2=occasionally
1=never or does not apply

TABLE XVI

DIAGNOSTIC PROCEDURES: MEAN SCORES
Elementary
1973-1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	Do you use the diagnostic materials in the basal reading program?	Do you use other diagnostic tests to determine individual needs?	Are individual reading programs planned for each student?	Do you involve the student in planning his own program?	Do you use a reading scope and sequence other than the one in the basal reader?
Kindergarten	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.2	1.9
1	3.9	3.0	2.8	2.2	2.2
2	3.6	3.2	2.8	2.4	2.3
3	3.8	3.3	2.9	2.5	2.4
4	3.9	3.5	3.0	2.8	2.3
5	3.6	3.6	3.2	2.9	2.6
34					
1 and 2 combined	3.7	3.4	3.3	2.4	2.5
2 and 3 combined	3.7	3.8	3.3	2.5	2.5
3-5	3.5	3.7	3.2	2.4	2.5
EMH, L.D.	2.4	4.5	5.8	3.6	4.0
DISTRICT	3.57	3.46	3.15	2.63	2.50
Key:	5=always				
	4=usually				
	3=frequently				
	2=occasionally				
	1=never or does not apply				

Instructional Materials

Instructional kits and packages are used occasionally at all levels. They are used most frequently in kindergarten, EMH, and L.D. classes. At all grade levels, instructional materials are kept where students can get to them easily.

Learning stations for reading are usually provided in all grades kindergarten through fifth and always in the EMH and L.D. classrooms. Kindergarten children are only occasionally allowed to choose their own reading material while children in all other grades are frequently allowed to do so. Games are used most frequently by kindergarten, EMH, and L.D. teachers as instructional tools in reading. (See Table XVII)

TABLE XVII

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS: MEAN SCORES
Elementary
1973-1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level	How often do you use instructional kits and packages?	Are instructional materials kept where students can get to them easily?	Do you have learning stations for reading in your classroom?	How often do you allow children to choose their own reading materials?	How often do you use games as in- structional tools in reading?
Kindergarten	3.3	4.1	3.8	2.2	3.8
1	2.4	4.0	3.7	3.1	3.4
2	2.4	4.0	3.7	3.4	3.3
3	2.5	4.0	3.6	3.4	3.0
4	2.3	4.0	3.6	3.3	2.9
5	2.4	4.0	3.6	3.2	3.0
1 and 2 combined	2.8	4.4	3.7	3.4	3.5
2 and 3 combined	2.3	4.1	3.6	3.6	3.2
3-5	2.3	3.8	3.4	3.1	3.2
ENH, L.D.	3.3	4.5	4.6	2.9	4.0
DISTRICT	2.51	4.07	3.71	3.20	3.24

Key: 5=always
4=usually
3=frequently
2=occasionally
1=never or does not apply

CHAPTER III

CONCLUSIONS

1. There may be a strong relationship between the drop in achievement scores at the fourth year grade level and the fact that only half of the fourth grade teachers feel it is their responsibility to provide formal reading instruction.
 - a. Forty-seven percent of all teachers in grades kindergarten through fifth reported that they personally held with the philosophy that, "in grades 1-3, children learn to read; in grades 4 and up, children read to learn."
 - b. At the fourth year grade level, fifty percent (49.6%) responded that this was their philosophy.
2. The sharp rise in the amount of team teaching at the fifth year level may in part account for the yearly gain in reading scores between fourth and fifth year students.
 - a. Eighty percent of instruction at the fifth year level occurs in a team teaching situation.
 - b. In grades kindergarten through fourth, 74.5% of all instruction is limited to self-contained classrooms.
3. Teachers have voiced a desire for further in-service training.
 - a. Areas of in-service training teachers have indicated would be most beneficial are:
Kindergarten--diagnostic techniques

- 1 --ways in which children learn
- 2 --ways in which children learn
- 3 --ways in which children learn
- 4 --individualized instruction
- 5 --individualized instruction

EMH, L.D. --ways in which children learn

- b. A majority of teachers (66%) responded they would attend more sessions if they were provided.
 - c. However, teachers have not always in the past attended the in-service sessions that have been provided.
4. Teachers at every level are not completely aware of the ranges in reading achievement levels of students in their classrooms.
- a. The following table shows the difference between the teachers' perceived range of reading achievement levels and the actual grade score span on the reading subtest of the 1973 Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT).

TABLE XVIII
COMPARISON OF PERCEIVED RANGE WITH
ACTUAL RANGE OF READING ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS
Elementary
1973-1974

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Teachers' Perceived Range of Reading Achievement Levels</u>	<u>Actual Grade Score Span (MRT)</u>
1	3 grade levels	1-5; 5 levels
2	3 grade levels	1-8; 8 levels
3	4 grade levels	1-9; 9 levels
4	4 grade levels	1-9; 9 levels
5	4 grade levels	1-9; 9 levels

- b. It is very possible that the span in reading achievement levels is even larger than the test scores reveal, as the MAT does not indicate scores below the first year level.

5. While the basal reading program employed in the District is effective with most children, test scores reveal other children are seemingly not responsive to this method.
 - a. Teachers in grades first through fifth selected the basal reader as the reading approach most preferred.
 - b. Materials provided in the basal reading program were the type of supportive materials utilized most frequently in the teaching of reading.
 - c. Diagnostic materials from the basal reading program are used extensively by teachers at all grade levels.
6. It would appear that intermediate teachers assume that word attack skills have been mastered by the end of second grade.
 - a. Word attack skills are stressed in first and second grades.
 - b. Comprehension skills are emphasized in the third, fourth, and fifth grades.
7. First and fourth year teachers are attempting to cover all the basal reading materials for their grade level each year.
 - a. Kindergarten, second, third, and fifth year teachers frequently cover all the material.
 - b. EMH and L.D. teachers only occasionally cover all materials for their grade levels each year.
8. Teachers spend almost as much time planning for each day as they do on actual reading instruction.
 - a. Over fifty percent (53%) of the teachers are unable to do the majority of their planning at school.
 - b. Fifth year teachers reported the greatest amount of time spent planning with other teachers.

9. Teachers at all levels, kindergarten through fifth, prefer to group for reading in the following order: (1) achievement groups; (2) skill study groups; (3) discussion groups; and (4) special interest groups.
10. Teachers reported that they are frequently grouping in their classrooms, yet at the same time they reported that most students in their classes are usually working at the same assignment. There is a definite contradiction between these two statements. Ideal grouping does not occur when all children in a classroom are divided into small groups to work on the same assignment.

APPENDIX A

ELEMENTARY READING SURVEY
DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND STATISTICS

School _____ School Code Number _____

Grade _____

- 5 = always
4 = usually
3 = frequently
2 = occasionally
1 = never or does not apply

The following questions are to be answered as they apply to the teaching of reading in your classroom.

A. How often do you use the following teaching techniques in reading:

lecture	(1)	5	4	3	2	1
question and answer (class)	(2)	5	4	3	2	1
question and answer (groups)	(3)	5	4	3	2	1
question and answer (individually)	(4)	5	4	3	2	1
contracts	(5)	5	4	3	2	1
discussion	(6)	5	4	3	2	1
reading to children	(7)	5	4	3	2	1
oral reading by children	(8)	5	4	3	2	1

B. Do you teach the following skills with each story in the basal reader:

word attack skills	(9)	5	4	3	2	1
comprehension	(10)	5	4	3	2	1
reference and study skills	(11)	5	4	3	2	1

B. continued

literary skills	(12)	5	4	3	2	1
-----------------	------	---	---	---	---	---

C. Do you use a reading scope and sequence other than the one in the basal reader?

(13)	5	4	3	2	1
------	---	---	---	---	---

D. How often do you use the following equipment in teaching reading:

cassette	(14)	5	4	3	2	1
----------	------	---	---	---	---	---

tape recorder	(15)	5	4	3	2	1
---------------	------	---	---	---	---	---

earphones	(16)	5	4	3	2	1
-----------	------	---	---	---	---	---

filmstrip projector	(17)	5	4	3	2	1
---------------------	------	---	---	---	---	---

overhead projector	(18)	5	4	3	2	1
--------------------	------	---	---	---	---	---

film projector	(19)	5	4	3	2	1
----------------	------	---	---	---	---	---

record player	(20)	5	4	3	2	1
---------------	------	---	---	---	---	---

tachistoscope	(21)	5	4	3	2	1
---------------	------	---	---	---	---	---

E. Do you cover all the basal reading materials for your grade level each year?

(22)	5	4	3	2	1
------	---	---	---	---	---

F. Do you feel pressure from the administration or competition with other teachers over the amounts of material covered?

(23)	5	4	3	2	1
------	---	---	---	---	---

G. How often do you plan with other teachers?

(24)	5	4	3	2	1
------	---	---	---	---	---

H. How often do you use games as instructional tools in reading?

(25)	5	4	3	2	1
------	---	---	---	---	---

I. How often do you use the following interactive involvement in teaching reading:

field trips	(26)	5	4	3	2	1
-------------	------	---	---	---	---	---

class projects	(27)	5	4	3	2	1
----------------	------	---	---	---	---	---

creative dramatics	(28)	5	4	3	2	1
--------------------	------	---	---	---	---	---

role playing	(29)	5	4	3	2	1
--------------	------	---	---	---	---	---

- J. How much do you use the teacher's guide when using the basal reader? (30) 5 4 3 2 1
- K. How often do you group for reading in the following ways:
- achievement groups (31) 5 4 3 2 1
 - discussion groups (32) 5 4 3 2 1
 - special interest groups (33) 5 4 3 2 1
 - skill study groups (34) 5 4 3 2 1
- L. How often are students involved in small group activities? (35) 5 4 3 2 1
- M. Are goals set before instruction in small group instruction? (36) 5 4 3 2 1
- N. How often do you use the following supportive materials for reading:
- supportive material from the basal reader (37) 5 4 3 2 1
 - teacher-pupil developed reading charts (38) 5 4 3 2 1
 - experience charts (39) 5 4 3 2 1
 - other teacher made material (40) 5 4 3 2 1
 - commercial remedial or developmental programs (41) 5 4 3 2 1
 - unipacs (42) 5 4 3 2 1
- O. How often do you use instructional kits and packages? (43) 5 4 3 2 1
- P. Are instructional materials kept where students can get to them easily? (44) 5 4 3 2 1
- Q. Do you have learning stations for reading in you classroom? (45) 5 4 3 2 1
- R. How responsible do you feel for helping students who come to you reading below grade level? (46) 5 4 3 2 1

- | | | | | | | |
|--|------|---|---|---|---|---|
| S. Do you use the diagnostic materials in the basal reading program? | (47) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| T. Do you use other diagnostic tests to determine individual needs? | (48) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| U. Are individual reading programs planned for each student? | (49) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| V. Do you involve the student in planning his own program? | (50) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| W. Is student performance measured in terms of his own program? | (51) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| X. Do you enter individual student records in a grade book? | (52) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Y. Do you use individual language progress folders for keeping individual student records? | (53) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Z. Do you allow students access to these records? | (54) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| AA. Are students kept informed of their progress at least weekly? | (55) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| BB. Do you evaluate skill mastery periodically? | (56) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| CC. How often are all the students in the class working at the same assignment? | (57) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| DD. When grouping, does every group meet with the teacher every day for instruction? | (58) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| EE. How often do you allow children to choose their own reading material? | (59) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

I. How much time every day on the average are the children in your class involved in reading instruction?

5 4 3 2 1
(2 or more hrs.) (1 hr. 30 min.) (1 hr.) (30 min.) (15 min.) (60)

II. The range in reading materials in my classroom is approximately:

5 4 3 2 1
(5 grade levels) (4 levels) (3 levels) (2 levels) (1 level) (61)

III. The range or difference in reading achievement level of students in my classroom is approximately:

5 4 3 2
(5 grade levels or more) (4 levels) (3 levels) (2 levels)
1
(1 level) (62)

IV. For every school day, I plan an average of:

5 4 3 2 1
(2 or more hrs.) (1 hr. 30 min.) (1 hr.) (30 min.) (15 min.) (63)

V. I am able to do a majority of my planning at school.

Yes _____ No _____ (64)

VI. Does the following statement reflect the reading philosophy of the majority of teachers in the Oklahoma City Public Schools?

In grades 1-3 children learn to read; in grades 4 and up children read to learn.

Yes _____ No _____ (65)

VII. Does the preceeding statement reflect your reading philosophy?

Yes _____ No _____ (66)

VIII. Do you presently teach in a:

self-contained classroom _____ (67)

team teaching situation _____ (68)

other _____ (69)

IX. Have you participated in any in-service training in this system?

Yes _____ No _____ (70)

X. If so, where was the in-service held?

at the Central Office _____ (71)

in your school building _____ (72)

in another school building _____ (73)

other _____ (74)

XI. If more after school in-service were offered would you attend?

Yes _____ No _____ (75)

XII. Do you feel the need for in-service on:

diagnostic techniques _____ (76)

small group instruction _____ (77)

individualized instruction _____ (78)

peer teaching _____ (79)

classroom organization and management _____ (80)

learning stations _____ (81)

ways in which children learn _____ (82)

XIII. Rank the following reading approaches according to your preference.
Number your choices 1 (high) through 7 (low).

basal reader _____ (83)

language experience approach to reading _____ (84)

library centered reading approach _____ (85)

programmed reading materials _____ (86)

predominately phonics approach _____ (87)

predominately sight approach _____ (88)

multi-media nongraded approach _____ (89)

APPENDIX B

TABLE XIX
ELEMENTARY READING SURVEY
DISTRICT MEANS, RANKS, AND PERCENTAGES

Item No.	$\bar{X}$	Item No.	$\bar{X}$	Item No.	Rank Order
1	1.93	41	2.77	76	3
2	2.99	42	1.48	77	6
3	3.72	43	2.51	78	2
4	3.52	44	4.07	79	7
5	1.89	45	3.71	80	5
6	3.98	46	4.69	81	4
7	3.36	47	3.57	82	1
8	3.65	48	3.46		
9	4.42	49	3.15		1--highest rank
10	4.51	50	2.63		7--lowest rank
11	3.68	51	4.13		
12	3.06	52	2.79		
13	2.50	53	4.15	83	1
14	2.27	54	1.84	84	4
15	2.70	55	2.82	85	6
16	2.93	56	4.01	86	5
17	2.70	57	3.85	87	2
18	2.67	58	4.27	88	7
19	2.05	59	3.20	89	3
20	2.98	60	3.55		
21	1.28	61	3.52		1--highest rank
22	2.86	62	3.53		7--lowest rank
23	1.41	63	3.34		
24	2.78				
25	3.24				
26	1.76				
28	2.56				
29	2.73				
30	4.41				
31	4.14				
32	2.89				
33	2.59				
34	3.48				
35	3.72				
36	4.13				
37	3.91				
38	2.89				
39	2.63				
40	3.52				
		Item No.	Percentage		
		64	Yes 47%	No 53%	
		65	Yes 62%	No 38%	
		66	Yes 47%	No 53%	
		67		51.8%	
		68		31.9%	
		69		12.0%	
		70	Yes 89%	No 11%	
		71		51.0%	
		72		35.3%	
		73		66.9%	
		74		13.3%	
		75		66.0%	

Scoring Key Mean ($\bar{X}$) Scores:

5=always
4=usually
3=frequently
2=occasionally
1=never or does not apply